

as to the reasons for their successes—though perhaps *Mein Kampf* has more scientific lessons in it than we suspect.

Fortunately, a few recent publications indicate that scientific study of this very point is proceeding, at least in the industrial field; *The Worker's Point of View* published anonymously by the Acton Society Trust exemplifies the difficulties of conveying information to a group of miners, *Three Studies in Management* by J. F. Scott and R. P. Lynton contribute accounts of success in so doing. No doubt both echo Elton Mayo's insistence on the importance of developing this skill. "If our social skills had advanced step by step with our technical skills, there would not have been another European war."

But such a study can, and must, be directed on scientific lines as are inquiries in the physical sciences. Is this taking place in other fields than industry? U.N.E.S.C.O. has shown the way; O.E.E.C. is perhaps considering it; your readers may know of other examples.

R. F. TREDGOLD.

11, Portland Place, London, W.1.

*To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Mr. Carson's ideal of world government by just men made perfect would of course be one way of solving our problem. But as no one today can have any illusions about its eventuating I see little point in debating the pros and cons. Sterilization of defectives is all very well, but doesn't end the matter. The real problem is the differential reproduction rate of whole cross sections. And my own conviction is that any system of licensing for the right to breed, if administered arbitrarily by autocrats and dictators, would resolve itself in the end into an unspeakably objectionable tyranny.

But it surprises me that Mr. Carson feels I have ignored the question of whether any scientific and intentional control of population is possible without a degree of compulsion. I conceived it to be the sole point of my article. Evidently I failed to make my meaning plain. The point I had hoped to make was that if the population problem is to be tackled this does not *inevitably* mean an increase in the State's dictation or an arbitrary interference with the most sacrosanct of functions. It is not beyond the wit of man to develop a device of government for regulating his numbers in a manner that is still consistent with equity and the rule of law. Our community even now lays down minimum standards for the care and upbringing, hygiene, housing and education of children. At present the State in large measure shoulders the cost. If the standards continued to be compulsory, but the cost reverted in every case to the parents, we would have in effect a measure of compulsion towards family limitation. I envisaged however nothing more dreadful in the way of sanctions than the ordinary processes of debt collection! Of course there would be cases where these processes

could not be fully enforced in the interests of children already living; but by and large the position of the over-fertile would be one to be avoided. Life for the feckless could be made at least beer-and-tobacco-less! The necessary corollaries of the system would have to be, as I pointed out in my article, a universal knowledge of birth control and a widening of economic opportunity, the latter to remedy whatever injustice such a system could entail.

The principle of the device could be universalized. It could be applied as well in Kenya as in Kent, but of course by very different processes and for very different standards. But even so I see no necessity to postulate, as Mr. Carson appears to do, that any attempt to grapple with the population problem must necessarily be world-wide. If even some communities succeeded in solving their domestic problem in some such way perhaps as I have suggested, and in raising their standard of living and technical achievement, it is at least arguable whether they might not survive ultimately to impose their way upon the world.

At the risk of repeating myself I must just once again insist that this dilemma presented to us is a false one. We need not inevitably choose between starvation and sterilization at the hands of dictators, benevolent or otherwise!

With Dr. Tredgold's letter I am in full agreement. Let us welcome scientific study of change in attitudes and beliefs. But more than this, let us also hope that the advocate of eugenic reform himself will never forget to bring to his subject the detached integrity and regard for truth that is found in science. This is really what I meant by saying "Let us have no more evangelizing." For it seems certain that any effort to solve eugenic and population problems must enter upon the spheres of religion, morals and politics. There will be controversy, and if good is to come of it, theories and discoveries must be debated in the same spirit as in science and not in an atmosphere of emotion, or as matters of faith and dogma.

W. J. SHAW.

Liselund, Old Avenue,  
Weybridge.

*To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Reviews are always incomplete because they are limited in length. But Mr. Carson touches upon a problem which is real when he considers population control and the forces which might be required to bring it about. There is, fortunately, much room for reasonably persuadable free will between the extremes of multiplication in thoughtlessness on the one hand and limitation by forceful compulsion on the other. A suitably adjusted system of family allowances, in the economic sphere, at once comes to mind as one appropriate and acceptable promoter of desirable trends.

G. C. L. BERTRAM.

St. John's College, Cambridge.